Relativistic corrections to isotope shift in light ions.

V A Korol* and M G Kozlov
Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, 188300, Russia
(Dated: February 5, 2008)

We calculate isotope mass shift for several light ions using Dirac wave functions and mass shift operator with relativistic corrections of the order of $(\alpha Z)^2$. Calculated relativistic corrections to the specific mass shift vary from a fraction of a percent for Carbon, to 2% for Magnesium. Relativistic corrections to the normal mass shift are typically smaller. Interestingly, the final relativistic mass shifts for the levels of one multiplet appear to be even closer than for non-relativistic operator. That can be important for the astrophysical search for possible α-variation, where isotope shift is a source of important systematic error. Our calculations show that for levels of the same multiplet this systematics is negligible and they can be used as probes for α-variation.

PACS numbers: 06.20.Jr, 31.30.Gs, 31.25.Jf

arXiv:astro-ph/0702667v1 25 Feb 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern theories (such as the string theory and M-theory) predict temporal and spatial variations of fundamental physical constants. Some recent studies of quasar absorbtion spectra indicate that the fine structure constant $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c$, where e is the charge of the electron and $\hbar$ and c are the reduced Planck constant and the speed of light respectively, could have changed during the evolution of the Universe (see [1] and the references therein). This result was not confirmed by other groups [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], and hence new experiments are required. Laboratory experiments are rapidly increasing their sensitivity to α-variation (see [7, 8] and references therein), but are currently slightly less sensitive than astrophysical ones, where the time scale is 10^{10} times longer. Finally, there may be some evidence for varying α from the natural nuclear reactor in Oklo, which operated about 2 billion years ago [9].

Astrophysical studies are based on the fact that atomic transition frequencies depend on the parameter $x = (\alpha/\alpha_0)^2 - 1$, where $\alpha_0 \approx 1/137$ is the laboratory value of α. Thus, one can look for α-variation by comparing the frequencies of atomic lines in the spectra of quasars with their laboratory values, which correspond to $x = 0$. One of the major systematic effects, which can imitate α-variation, is the isotope shift (IS). It had been shown previously [10, 11, 12, 13] that typical IS is of the same order of magnitude as the effect observed in [1].

In [14], a method to separate the effect of varying α from the IS was proposed. This method is based on building special combinations of atomic frequencies, some of which are insensitive to both effects ("anchors"), while the other are independent on the IS, but sensitive to α-variations ("probes"). One could then use the anchors to retrieve the actual value of the redshift of the spectrum, and then use the probes to evaluate the size of the variation $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$. In addition, one can form the probes that are sensitive to the IS, but not to the variation of α. These probes could provide information about isotopic abundances in the early Universe. Such information should also be of interest to the astrophysicists, because isotopic evolution is tightly linked with the general evolution of the Universe.

Described method of anchors and probes requires precise calculations of atomic relativistic coefficients q, which determine the dependence of transition frequencies on x, and the IS coefficients $k_{\rm IS}$. Factors q strongly depend on the total angular momentum J, which distinguishes levels of the same multiplet. Relativistic corrections to the coefficients $k_{\rm IS}$ are known to be small and their dependence on J is much weaker. Nevertheless in order to separate two effects reliably, one needs to accurately account for relativistic corrections to IS. For light atoms IS is dominated by the mass shift (MS). Usually MS calculations are done with Dirac wave functions, but using non-relativistic form of MS operator. In this paper we report results of the MS calculations for 12 light atoms and ions. We use the MS operator, which includes relativistic corrections of the order of $(\alpha Z)^2$ [15, 16, 17]. It is shown that relativistic corrections to the operator partly compensate corrections to the wave functions and final relativistic corrections are smaller than in previous calculations. That may help to distinguish between α-variation and isotope effects in astrophysics.

II. METHOD

A. Theory of isotope shift

Total IS consists of MS and field shift (FS). The former accounts for the finite mass of the nucleus, and the latter accounts for the finite size of the nucleus. In the non-relativistic theory the MS is further divided into normal mass shift (NMS), and specific mass shift (SMS). The overall IS in the frequency of any atomic transition of the isotope with mass number A' with respect to the isotope with mass number A can be written as (see, for

*Electronic address: vakorol@mail.ru

example [18]):

$$\delta\nu^{A',A} = (k_{\rm NMS} + k_{\rm SMS}) \left(\frac{1}{A'} - \frac{1}{A}\right) + F\,\delta\left\langle r^2\right\rangle^{A',A}, \quad (1)$$

where $\left\langle r^2\right\rangle$ is the nuclear mean square radius, F is the FS coefficient and $k_{\rm MS} = k_{\rm NMS} + k_{\rm SMS}$ is the MS coefficient. In the non-relativistic theory NMS is described by one-electron operator,

$$H^{\rm (nr)}_{\rm NMS} = \frac{1}{2M}\sum_i \boldsymbol{p}_i^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{p}_i$ is momentum of the i-th electron. Because of the virial theorem $k_{\rm NMS}$ has the simple form:

$$k^{\rm (nr)}_{\rm NMS} = -\frac{\omega}{1823}, \quad (3)$$

where the number 1823 refers to the ratio of the atomic mass unit (amu) to the electron mass. SMS is described by a two-electron operator:

$$H^{\rm (nr)}_{\rm SMS} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i<k} \boldsymbol{p}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{p}_k\,. \quad (4)$$

Consistent relativistic theory of MS can be formulated only within quantum electrodynamics in a form of expansion in αZ. It was shown in Refs. [15, 16, 17] that the first two terms of the expansion in αZ lead to the following relativistic MS Hamiltonian:

$$H^{\rm (r)}_{\rm MS} = \frac{1}{2M}\sum_{i,j}\left\{\boldsymbol{p}_i\boldsymbol{p}_j - \frac{\alpha Z}{r_i}\left[\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_i)\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_i\right]\boldsymbol{p}_j\right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ is the Dirac matrix of the i-th electron and $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}} = \boldsymbol{r}/r$. As in the non-relativistic theory, one can divide Hamiltonian (5) into the one- and two-electron terms:

$$H_{\rm NMS} = \frac{1}{2M}\sum_i\left\{\boldsymbol{p} - \frac{\alpha Z}{2r}\left[\boldsymbol{\alpha} + (\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{r}})\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}\right]\right\}_i^2, \quad (6)$$

$$H_{\rm SMS} = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i<k}\left\{\boldsymbol{p} - \frac{\alpha Z}{2r}\left[\boldsymbol{\alpha} + (\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{r}})\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}\right]\right\}_i \times\left\{\boldsymbol{p} - \frac{\alpha Z}{2r}\left[\boldsymbol{\alpha} + (\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{r}})\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}\right]\right\}_k. \quad (7)$$

Non-relativistic expression (3) is not applicable to operator (6) and now $k_{\rm NMS}$ has to be calculated on a same footing as $k_{\rm SMS}$.

As pointed out above, for the light atoms and ions FS is much smaller than MS. Still for the comparison with high precision experiments one may need to account for FS. Below we focus on calculating MS, but in the final Table V we present FS factors for some of the transitions.

B. Electron correlations

IS is very sensitive to electron correlations. High accuracy calculations must account not only for correlations between valence electrons, but also for core-valence correlations. Here we treat both types of correlations within CI+MBPT method [19]. In this method the configuration interaction (CI) calculation is done for valence electrons using effective Hamiltonian $H_{\rm eff}$, which is formed within the second order many body perturbation theory (MBPT) in the residual core-valence interaction. All our calculations are done with modified Dirac-Fock code [20], CI code [21], and MBPT code [19].

CI+MBPT method is easily reformulated for the IS calculations within the finite-field approximation. In this approximation the IS operator $H_{\rm IS}$ is added to the many-particle Hamiltonian H with an arbitrary coefficient λ:

$$H_\lambda = H + \lambda H_{\rm IS}. \quad (8)$$

The eigenvalue problem for Hamiltonian (8) is solved for $+\lambda$ and for $-\lambda$. Then, the IS correction to the energy is recovered as:

$$\Delta E_{\rm IS} = \frac{E_{+\lambda} - E_{-\lambda}}{2\lambda}. \quad (9)$$

All calculations are done independently for the field, normal, and specific parts of the IS. Parameter λ is chosen from the considerations of the numerical stability and smallness of the the non-linear terms. In the CI+MBPT calculations Hamiltonian (8) is used to construct $H_{\lambda,\rm eff}$. That means that H_λ is used on all stages of calculation starting from solving Dirac-Fock equations for atomic core.

CI+MBPT method provides the solution of the eigenvalue problem for valence electrons $H_{\rm eff}\Psi = E\Psi$, which is an approximation to all-electron problem $H\Psi = E\Psi$. The latter equation gives an exact solution for the given basis set. Unfortunately this equation can be solved only for atoms with few electrons and only for very short basis sets. Nevertheless, on a short basis set we can compare all-electron and CI+MBPT calculations with some simple calculation (for example, with one-configurational approximation) and designate corresponding corrections as $\Delta^{\rm short}$ and $\Delta^{\rm short}_{\rm eff}$. Then we repeat CI+MBPT calculation on a much longer basis set and find new correction $\Delta^{\rm long}_{\rm eff}$. Although we can not make all-electron calculation for the long basis set, we can use the short basis set calculation to shift the central point of the final CI+MBPT calculation and estimate its error:

$$\delta_{\rm shift} \approx \Delta^{\rm short} - \Delta^{\rm short}_{\rm eff}\,, \quad (10)$$

$$\delta_{\rm err} \approx \delta_{\rm shift}\frac{\Delta^{\rm long}_{\rm eff}}{\Delta^{\rm short}_{\rm eff}}\,. \quad (11)$$

We will use Eq. (10) where possible to improve CI+MBPT results and Eq. (11) to estimate theoretical error.

III. RESULTS OF THE CALCULATIONS

A. Lithium-like ions

Lithium is the most simple atom in our consideration, since it has only one core orbital $1s$ and one valence electron. The simplicity of this system allows one to perform all-electron (full) CI calculation for all three electrons. Such calculation provides an exact solution on a given one-electron basis set and allows to improve our results and to control their accuracy using Eqs. (10, 11). The basis set consists of the orbitals: 1–9s, 2–9p, 3–8d, and 4–8f (basis set [9sp8df]). CI+MBPT calculation is then done with two longer basis sets: valence CI space is defined by the basis set [13sp12df] and all intermediate MBPT summations run over basis set [17sp18d19f20g21h] (see [22] for details).

In Table I we compare our MS calculations with the experiment. For Li the relative size of FS is about 10^{-5} and we neglect it.

TABLE I: Isotope shifts (in MHz) in the spectrum of ^{6}Li, with respect to ^{7}Li. In the second column result of our CI+MBPT calculation is given. Third column presents corrected values using Eq. (10) and the errors are estimated with the help of Eq. (11).

Transition	Theory		Exper.
	CI+MBPT	Final	
$2s_{1/2} \to 2p_{1/2}$	10346	10608(300)	10534.26(13)[a]
			10532.9(6)[b]
			10534.3(3)[c]
			10533.13(15)[d]
$2s_{1/2} \to 2p_{3/2}$	10346	10607(300)	10533.3(5)[b]
			10539.9(1.2)[c]
			10534.93(15)[d]
$2s_{1/2} \to 3p_{1/2}$	14162	14354(200)	14470(450)[e]
$2s_{1/2} \to 3p_{3/2}$	14162	14398(250)	14470(450)[e]
$2s_{1/2} \to 3d_{3/2}$	13194	13450(300)	13314(6)[f]
			13312(4)[g]
$2s_{1/2} \to 3d_{5/2}$	13194	13450(300)	13314(6)[f]
			13312(4)[g]
$2s_{1/2} \to 4s_{1/2}$	14560	14750(200)	14656(6)[f]
			14661(14)[g]

[a] Walls *et al.*[23]
[b] Sansonetti *et al.*[24]
[c] Windholz and Umfer [25]
[d] Scherf *et al.*[26]
[e] Mariella [27]
[f] Lorenzen and Niemax [28]
[g] Kowalski *et al.*[29]

We see that most experimental results for IS in Li are much more accurate than our calculations. Corrections (10) lead to significant improvement of the agreement between calculations and experiment. The error estimate (11) appears to be quite reliable here as most calculated CI+MBPT values and all corrected values agree with experimental data within the estimated errors. We conclude that Eqs. (10, 11) work nicely for Lithium. On the other hand, even for such a simple system as Li, our theoretical error for MS appears to be about 2%, while the typical error for the frequencies is only about 0.1%. That shows the extreme sensitivity of the MS to correlations and significantly more important role of the high order MBPT corrections, which are neglected here.

Calculations of other Li-like ions are done in a similar way using basis sets of the same length. Corresponding results for C IV, N V and O VI are given in the final Table V. There we also use Eq. (11) to estimate theoretical accuracy.

B. B II, C III, and C II

We treat Be-like ions B II and C III as two-electron ions with $1s^2$ core and the ground state $^1S_0\left[2s^2\right]$. Since the full 4-electron CI calculation is more complex than in the case of 3-electron Li, a shorter basis set [5sp4df] is used here for such calculation. Valence 2-electron CI calculations were done with [10sp9df] and MBPT corrections were calculated using [16sp17d18f19g20h] basis set.

There are many experimental results for B II. Table II presents the comparison of calculated and experimental IS for B II. Unlike the case of lithium, here for most transitions the estimated theoretical error is smaller than experimental one. We see that generally there is good agreement between theory and experiment. Our calculation of IS in transition $^1P^o_1 \to {}^1D_2$ is in good agreement with the measurement [30], but is 3σ away from the result of Ref. [31]. Note that for the transition $^1P^o_1 \to {}^1S_0$ the MBPT correction for the long basis set appears to be anomalously large. That leads to the much larger theoretical error, than for other transitions.

C II is the only B-like ion which is interesting for astrophysics. It is also of a particular interest to us because the experiment [33] hints at approximately 2% difference between the shifts for the relativistic doublet. If this is confirmed, it will mean that relativistic corrections to IS are quite large even for light ions and should be included in accurate calculations. That will also make isotope effects more dangerous for the astrophysical searches for α-variation.

The ground state of C II is $^2P^o_{1/2}\left[2s^2 2p_{1/2}\right]$. It has five electrons and full CI becomes impractical even for the short basis set. That makes it more difficult to determine theoretical error. Using our calculations for Li-like and Be-like ions we estimate theoretical error for C II to be about 1 – 2%. On the other hand, with relativistic MS operators (6) and (7) the relative size of the shifts within one multiplet should be also accurate to few percent. Our results shown in Table III indicate that the difference between the shifts in this doublet must be roughly two orders of magnitude smaller than hinted by the experiment [33]. In fact, as we discuss below in more detail, using relativistic operator (5) brings MS shifts for the levels of one multiplet closer to each other than with non-relativistic operators (2) and (4).

TABLE II: Isotope shifts (in MHz) for ^{11}B with respect to ^{10}B in the spectrum of B II.

Transition	λ (Å)	IS Theory	IS Exper.
$^1S_0[2s^2] \to {}^1P^o_1[2s2p]$	1362	21303(66)	21000(3000)[a]
			21000(3000)[b]
$^3P^o_1[2s2p] \to {}^3P_2[2p^2]$	1624	22367(170)	21600(3600)[a]
			24000(3600)[b]
$^3P^o_0[2s2p] \to {}^3P_1[2p^2]$	1624	22369(170)	21600(3600)[a]
			21600(3600)[b]
$^3P^o_1[2s2p] \to {}^3P_1[2p^2]$	1624	22370(170)	21600(6900)[a]
			21600(6900)[b]
$^3P^o_2[2s2p] \to {}^2P_2[2p^2]$	1624	22369(170)	21600(4500)[a]
			18300(4500)[b]
$^3P^o_1[2s2p] \to {}^3P_0[2p^2]$	1624	22371(170)	21600(3600)[a]
			21600(3600)[b]
$^3P^o_2[2s2p] \to {}^3P_1[2p^2]$	1624	22372(170)	21600(3600)[a]
			21600(3600)[b]
$^1P^o_1[2s2p] \to {}^1S_0[2p^2]$	1843	12689(580)	12600(1200)[b]
$^1P^o_1[2s2p] \to {}^1D_2[2p^2]$	3451	26663(55)	26600(100) [b]
			26300(120)[c]

[a]Jönsson *et al.*[32]
[b]Litzen *et al.*[30]
[c]Vinti [31]

TABLE III: IS for ^{13}C in respect to ^{12}C in the doublet line $^2S_{1/2}[2s2p^2] \to {}^2P^o_J[2s^23p]$ of C II. Here we use relativistic MS operators (6) and (7). Calculation of Berengut et al. [34] was done with non-relativistic operators.

Transition	λ, Å	IS (MHz) This work	Theory [34]	Exper. [33]
$^2S_{1/2} \to {}^2P^o_{3/2}$	2836.707	−18185.0	−18500	−18350(60)
$^2S_{1/2} \to {}^2P^o_{1/2}$	2837.605	−18185.9	−18500	−18680(90)

C. Sodium-like ions and Mg I

There are several Na-like ions which are important for astrophysics, namely Na I, Mg II, Al III, and Si IV. For Na I and Mg II there are experimental data available and we compare calculated MS with the experiment in Table IV. Using nuclear radii from Ref. [35] we have estimated FS for $3s \to 3p$ transitions in $^{22-23}$Na I and $^{24-26}$Mg II to be about -2 and $+16$ MHz, respectively. This is significantly smaller than the uncertainty in our MS calculation.

In these calculations for Na I, Al III and Si IV we use CI basis set $[14sp13df]$ and MBPT basis set $[19sp18d19f20g21h]$. Our IS results for Si IV are within 1% agreement with calculation of Berengut et al. [36], while the differences for Mg I are larger and can reach several percent.

Neutral magnesium is one of the most well studied two-electron atoms. The data from several experimental works on IS in Mg I,II are presented in Table IV and compared with theoretical IS calculated on the basis sets $[12spd9f]$ and $[17spdf9gh]$.

TABLE IV: Comparison with experiment for IS in Na I and Mg I,II. The FS is neglected (see text). All numbers are in MHz.

Transition	λ, Å	MS	IS (expt.)
$^{22-23}$Na I			
$3s \to 3p_{1/2}$	5896	775.8	758.5(7)[a]
			756.9(1.9)[b]
$3s \to 3p_{3/2}$	5890	776.5	757.72(24)[c]
$^{24-26}$Mg II			
$3s \to 3p_{3/2}$	2796	3086.3	3050(100)[d]
$^{24-26}$Mg I			
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^3P^o_1[3s3p]$	4571	2686.9	2683.2(0)[e]
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^1P^o_1[3s3p]$	2852	1425.3	1415.3(5.0)[f]
$^3P^o_0[3s3p] \to {}^3S_1[3s4s]$	5167	−367.9	−395.7(6.0)[g]
$^3P^o_1[3s3p] \to {}^3S_1[3s4s]$	5173	−369.9	−391.2(4.5)[g]
$^3P^o_2[3s3p] \to {}^3S_1[3s4s]$	5184	−373.1	−392.7(7.5)[g]
$^3P^o_1[3s3p] \to {}^3D_2[3s3d]$	3832	58.7	60.6(3.0)[h]
$^3P^o_2[3s3p] \to {}^3D_3[3s3d]$	3838	55.8	58.2(3.6)[h]
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^1P^o_1[3s4p]$	2026	2975.0	2918.9(1.2)[i]
$^{24-25}$Mg I			
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^3P^o_1[3s3p]$	4571	1397.2	1405.2(0.1)[e]
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^1P^o_1[3s3p]$	2852	741.2	743.8(3.0)[f]
$^3P^o_2[3s3p] \to {}^3S_1[3s4s]$	5184	−194.0	−203.9(7.5)[g]
$^1S_0[3s^2] \to {}^1P^o_1[3s4p]$	2026	1547.0	1526.4(1.2)[i]

[a]Pescht *et al.*[37]
[b]Huber *et al.*[38]
[c]Gangrsky *et al.*[39]
[d]Drullinger *et al.*[40]
[e]Sterr *et al.*[41]
[f]Beverini *et al.*[42]
[g]Hallstadius & Hansen [43]
[h]Hallstadius [44]
[i]Hanneman *et al.*[45]

IV. DISCUSSION

Our final results for MS in astrophysically important transitions are listed in Table V. Where available we also give FS parameters and results of other calculations of SMS and relativistic q-factors. The latter are known to be significantly different for the lines of one multiplet because the splittings within the multiplet are caused by relativistic spin-orbit interaction and scales as $(\alpha Z)^2$. That makes these splittings natural candidates as probes for α-variation. However, J-dependence of IS may introduce some systematic errors as isotope abundances in the Universe may vary significantly. Here we use relativistic MS operators and show that J-dependence for MS is smaller than one might expect from the simple considerations and from experiment [33]. That means that multiplet splittings are indeed good probes for α-variation.

In several cases we also made SMS calculations using non-relativistic operator (4) (see Table V). Comparison with our relativistic values indicate that relativistic corrections grow from a fraction of a percent for Carbon ions to about 1 – 2% for Mg I,II. It is interesting though, that

TABLE V: Isotope shift parameters for astrophysically important transitions in Li-, Be-, B-, and Na-like ions, and in Mg I. The experimental values for the transition wavelengths were taken from the NIST atomic spectra database (http://physics.nist.gov). The SMS and NMS parameters are given in GHz·amu, the FS parameter F is given in MHz/fm^2. Non-relativistic values for $k_{\rm SMS}$ and $k_{\rm SMS}$ were obtained with operator (4) and scaling (3) respectively.

Transition	λ, Å	$k_{\rm SMS}$			$k_{\rm NMS}$		F	q
		non-rel.	rel.	other works	non-rel.	rel.		
C IV								
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{1/2}$	1551	−4509	−4498(45)	−4511(23)[a]	−1060.5	−1061.1	−174	104[d]
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{3/2}$	1548	−4502	−4499(45)	−4504(23)[a]	−1062.3	−1061.2	−173	232[d]
C III								
$^1S_0[2s^2] \rightarrow {}^3P^o_0[2s2p]$	1910	−3461	−3453(7)	−3473[a]	−861.2	−860.3		74[a]
$^1S_0[2s^2] \rightarrow {}^3P^o_1[2s2p]$	1909	−3459	−3454(7)	−3472[a]	−861.6	−860.2		108[a]
$^1S_0[2s^2] \rightarrow {}^3P^o_2[2s2p]$	1907	−3456	−3454(7)	−3468[a]	−862.6	−860.1		178[a]
$^1S_0[2s^2] \rightarrow {}^1P^o_1[2s2p]$	977	−2778	−2774(80)	−2790[a]	−1683.3	−1677.3		165[a]
C II								
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^2S_{1/2}[2s2p^2]$	1036		−1295	−1321[a]	−1586.9	−1591.1		168[a]
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^2D_{3/2}[2s2p^2]$	1335		−2636	−2671[a]	−1232.3	−1230.3		178[a]
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^2D_{5/2}[2s2p^2]$	1334		−2637	−2672[a]	−1232.3	−1230.4		181[a]
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^4P_{1/2}[2s2p^2]$	2325		−2971	−2960[a]	−707.2	−700.8		132[a]
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^4P_{3/2}[2s2p^2]$	2324		−2972	−2958[a]	−707.6	−700.8		158[a]
$^2P^o_{1/2}[2s^22p] \rightarrow {}^4P_{5/2}[2s2p^2]$	2322		−2973	−2956[a]	−708.1	−700.6		202[a]
N V								
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{1/2}$	1243	−7123	−7099(70)		−1323.3	−1324.7	−417	196[e]
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{3/2}$	1239	−7109	−7103(70)		−1327.6	−1325.7	−386	488[e]
O VI								
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{1/2}$	1038	−10312	−10266(100)		−1585.0	−1587.0	−719	340[d]
$2s_{1/2} \rightarrow 2p_{3/2}$	1032	−10283	−10273(100)		−1593.7	−1590.5	−719	872[d]
Na I								
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{1/2}$	5896		−116	−108(24)[b] −97[c]	−278.9	−278.3	−33	45[d]
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{3/2}$	5890		−116	−107(24)[b] −97[c]	−279.2	−278.5	−33	63[d]
Mg II								
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{1/2}$	2803	−387	−378	−373(12)[b] −362[c]	−586.6	−586.7	−127	120[e]
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{3/2}$	2796	−381	−378	−373(6)[b] −361[c]	−588.1	−587.3	−127	211[e]
Mg I								
$^1S_0[3s^2] \rightarrow {}^1P^o_1[3s4p]$	2026	−102	−101	−108[f]	−811.6	−816.9	−175	87[f]
$^1S_0[3s^2] \rightarrow {}^1P^o_1[3s3p]$	2852	129	130	134[f]	−576.5	−575.3	−175	94[f]
Al III								
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{1/2}$	1863		−835		−882.9	−882.6	−254	216[e]
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{3/2}$	1855		−834		−886.7	−884.6	−254	464[e]
Si IV								
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{1/2}$	1403		−1510	−1535(11)[b]	−1172.4	−1171.1	−497	362[e]
$3s_{1/2} \rightarrow 3p_{3/2}$	1394		−1507	−1505(7)[b]	−1180.0	−1175.6	−480	766[e]

[a] Berengut *et al.*[34]
[b] Berengut *et al.*[36]
[c] Safronova & Johnson [47]
[d] Berengut *et al.*[48]
[e] Dzuba *et al.*[49]
[f] Berengut *et al.*[50]

relativistic MS values for one multiplet tend to be closer to each other than non-relativistic values. The difference between final MS shifts within one multiplet appear to be much smaller than relativistic corrections themselves. It should be mentioned that non-relativistic SMS presented in Table V was obtained by applying operator (4) only to the upper components of the Dirac functions. If this operator is applied to both components, the result tends to be noticeably farther from the correct relativistic value [51].

It should be mentioned that relativistic calculations of NMS require special care. Indeed, even in the non-relativistic limit calculated NMS will correspond to the scaling (3) for theoretical, rather then experimental frequency. For light many-electron atoms the difference between experimental and calculated frequencies can be larger than actual relativistic effects. To account for that one can multiply calculated relativistic NMS by the ratio $\omega_{\rm exper}/\omega_{\rm theor}$. The values presented in Table V include this correction.

Using q-factors from Table V we can also form number of probes for isotope abundances, which are insensitive to α-variations. There are several such probes for Carbon ions. The following probe for C IV:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1^{\rm IS} &= 0.69\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{1/2}\big)_{\rm C\,IV} \qquad (12)\\ &- 0.31\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{3/2}\big)_{\rm C\,IV} = 24470.71\ {\rm cm}^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

has the MS parameter $k_{\rm MS} = 2112$ GHz·amu. More probes can be constructed from C III lines:

$$\begin{aligned} P_2^{\rm IS} &= 0.71\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^3P_0^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} \qquad (13)\\ &- 0.29\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^3P_2^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} = 21970.95\ {\rm cm}^{-1},\\ P_3^{\rm IS} &= 0.59\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^3P_0^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} \qquad (14)\\ &- 0.41\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^3P_1^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} = 9416.36\ {\rm cm}^{-1},\\ P_4^{\rm IS} &= 0.69\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^3P_0^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} \qquad (15)\\ &- 0.31\omega\big({}^1S_0\to {}^1P_1^o\big)_{\rm C\,III} = 4404.14\ {\rm cm}^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

These probes have $k_{\rm MS} = 1810$ GHz·amu, 776 GHz·amu and 1593 GHz·amu, respectively. Finally, one can form two probes for Nitrogen and Oxygen:

$$\begin{aligned} P_5^{\rm IS} &= 0.71\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{1/2}\big)_{\rm N\,V} \qquad (16)\\ &- 0.29\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{3/2}\big)_{\rm N\,V} = 33719.52\ {\rm cm}^{-1}\\ &\qquad (k_{\rm MS} = 3537\ {\rm GHz{\cdot}amu}),\\ P_6^{\rm IS} &= 0.72\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{1/2}\big)_{\rm O\,VI} \qquad (17)\\ &- 0.28\omega\big(2s_{1/2}\to 2p_{3/2}\big)_{\rm O\,VI} = 42255.9\ {\rm cm}^{-1}\\ &\qquad (k_{\rm MS} = 5213\ {\rm GHz{\cdot}amu}). \end{aligned}$$

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have used the method of the effective Hamiltonian to calculate IS for astrophysically important transitions in ions with several valence electrons. We used relativistic MS operators and found out that relativistic corrections for light ions are not suppressed numerically and are of the order of $(\alpha Z)^2$, i.e. 1% for $Z \approx 10$. On the other hand, the difference between MS values for one multiplet appears to be at least one order of magnitude smaller.

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, grant No. 05-02-16914. VK also acknowledges support from St.Petersburg government, grant No. M06-2.4D-220 and the grants of the Dynasty foundation and the Alferov fund.

[1] M. T. Murphy *et al.*, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **345** (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0310318].
[2] D. A. Varshalovich, A. Y. Potekhin, and A. V. Ivanchik, Phys. Scr. **T95**, 76 (2001).
[3] A. M. Fiorenzano, G. Vladilo, and P. Bonifacio, Mem. S.A.It. Suppl. Vol. **3**, 252 (2003), arXiv:physics/0312270.
[4] R. Quast, D. Reimers, and S. A. Levshakov, Astron. Astrophysics **414**, L7 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0311280].
[5] S. Levshakov *et al.*, Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union **1**, 221-222 (2005), arXiv:physics/0512287.
[6] H. Chand *et al.*(2006), arXiv:physics/0601194.
[7] E. Peik et al. (2006), arXiv:physics/0611088.
[8] A. Cingoz et al. (2006), arXiv:physics/0609014.
[9] S. K. Lamoreaux and J. R. Torgerson, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 121701 (2004).
[10] S. A. Levshakov, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **269**, 339 (1994).
[11] M. T. Murphy *et al.*, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **327**, 1223 (2001).
[12] T. Ashenfelter, G. J. Mathews, and K. A. Olive, arXiv:astro-ph/0309197 (2003).
[13] Y. Fenner, M. T. Murphy, and B. K. Gibson, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **358**, 468 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0501168.
[14] M. G. Kozlov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062108 (2004).
[15] V. M. Shabaev and A. N. Artemyev, J. Phys. B **27**, 1307 (1994).
[16] A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 1884 (1995).
[17] V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 59 (1998).
[18] W. H. King, *Isotope shifts in atomic spectra* (Plenum

Press, New York, 1984).
[19] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3948 (1996).
[20] V. F. Bratsev, G. B. Deyneka, and I. I. Tupitsyn, Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR, Phys. Ser. **41**, 173 (1977).
[21] S. A. Kotochigova and I. I. Tupitsyn, J. Phys. B **20**, 4759 (1987).
[22] M. G. Kozlov and S. G. Porsev, Sov. Phys.–JETP **84**, 461 (1997).
[23] J. Walls *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. D **22**, 159 (2003).
[24] C. Sansonetti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 2682 (1995).
[25] L. Windholz and C. Umfer, Z. Phys. D: At., Mol. Clusters **29**, 121 (1994).
[26] W. Scherf *et al.*, Z. Phys. D: At., Mol. Clusters **36**, 31 (1996).
[27] R. Jr Mariella, Applied Phys. Lett. **35**, 580 (1979).
[28] C.-J. Lorenzen and K. Niemax, J. Phys. B **15**, L139 (1982).
[29] J. Kowalski *et al.*, Z. Phys. A **287**, 247 (1978).
[30] U. Litzen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 2477 (1998).
[31] J. Vinti, Phys. Rev. **58**, 879 (1940).
[32] P. Jönsson *et al.*, Astrophys. J **499**, L107 (1998).
[33] C. R. Burnett, Phys. Rev. **80**, 494 (1950).
[34] J. C. Berengut, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012504 (2006).
[35] I. Angeli, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **87**, 185 (2004).
[36] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022502 (2003).
[37] K. Pescht, H. Gerhardt, and E. Matthias, Z. Phys. A **281**, 199 (1977).
[38] G. Huber *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **18**, 2342 (1978).
[39] Y. P. Gangrsky *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. A **3**, 313 (1998).
[40] R. Drullinger, D. Wineland, and J. Bergquist, Appl. Phys. **22**, 365 (1980).
[41] U. Sterr *et al.*, Appl. Phys. B **56**, 62 (1993).
[42] N. Beverini et al., Optics Communications **77**, 299 (1990).
[43] L. Hallstadius and J. E. Hansen, Z. Phys. A **285**, 365 (1978).
[44] L. Hallstadius, Z. Phys. A **291**, 203 (1979).
[45] S. Hannemann et al., Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012505 (2006).
[46] J. Carlsson *et al.*, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Phys. **28**, 3729 (1995).
[47] M. S. Safronova and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052501 (2001).
[48] J. C. Berengut *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 064101 (2004), arXiv:physics/0404008.
[49] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 230 (1999).
[50] J. C. Berengut, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 044501 (2005).
[51] I. I. Tupitsyn et al., Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022511 (2003).